



1984

Political Moderation in the French Restoration: Chateaubriand's Political Thought, 1814-1820

Daniel T. Keefe
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses



Part of the [History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Keefe, Daniel T., "Political Moderation in the French Restoration: Chateaubriand's Political Thought, 1814-1820" (1984). *Master's Theses*. 3387.
https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses/3387

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).
Copyright © 1984 Daniel T. Keefe

POLITICAL MODERATION IN THE FRENCH RESTORATION:
CHATEAUBRIAND'S POLITICAL THOUGHT, 1814-1820

by

Daniel T. Keefe

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts
December
1984

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to acknowledge the patience and guidance of his committee members, Professor Franklin A. Walker, Thesis Director, and Professor Walter D. Gray, Chairman, Department of History, Loyola University of Chicago.

VITA

The author, Daniel Thomas Keefe, is the son of Dr. Robert and Patricia (Monahan) Keefe. He was born June 8, 1958, in San Francisco, California.

His elementary education was obtained in the private schools of San Francisco. His secondary education was completed in 1976 at the Junipero Serra High School, San Mateo, California.

In September, 1976, he entered Santa Clara University, Santa Clara, California, and in 1978 attended the Loyola University Rome Center. In May, 1981, he received the degree of Bachelor of Arts in Political Science, and was given the Robert Hartnett Award for Excellence in Political Theory from Loyola University of Chicago.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
VITA	iii
INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter	
I. CHATEAUBRIAND'S POLITICAL ASSOCIATIONS	6
II. THE INTENTIONS OF <u>DES BOUNAPARTE ET DES BOURBONS</u> ..	11
III. THE LIMITATIONS OF POLITICAL AUTHORITY	26
IV. <u>LE CONSERVATEUR</u> , AND THE END OF MODERATION	38
EPILOGUE	46
BIBLIOGRAPHY	48

Introduction

In 1820, a fanatical Bonapartist named Louvel assassinated an heir to the Bourbon throne, the Duke of Berry. The crime shocked the whole of France. More importantly, it symbolized the dividing line in the French Restoration, between the years 1814-1820, and 1820 until the overthrow of Charles X in 1830. Until 1820 it was hoped that France could reconcile her new constitution, her revolutionary legacy, and her ancient traditions and institutions. After the Duke's death, France was burdened with two hostile factions, unwilling to compromise and moving toward opposite extremes.[1]

The reaction to Louvel's crime was most severe among the royalists, those united by a fundamental belief in the monarchy. They perceived the assassination to be proof that the political opposition would stop at nothing to achieve its goals. Prominent among the royalists in condemning the act, and indicting its presumed liberal supporters, was the

1. Guillaume de Bertier de Sauvigny, The Bourbon Restoration[Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Press, 1966], pp.165-66.

eminent literary figure, François René Viscount Chateaubriand (1768-1848). Though famous more for his literary successes, including the Genius of Christianity and the novels Atala and René, Chateaubriand in 1814 turned his writing to politics, and until 1820 labored to defend the Bourbon monarchy and the traditions of France which had been threatened by the Revolution of 1789, as well as the Charter which was born with the overthrow of Napoleonic government.

He is in many ways a curious figure in the Restoration, a man dedicated to the monarchy, to religion, to a glorified French history in which wisdom, toleration and courage defined the Frenchman's life. Yet he also welcomed consitutional government in France in the form of the Charter, and supported the idealism of the Revolution. He represented in his views the old and the new France, and for six years was confident that his theories could reconcile the two.

It was an audacious goal he set for himself. He was not a systematic thinker, and trying to harmonize what were often contradictory theories of government made his work complex, sometimes simply confused. Yet even if he did not succeed in his task, his political writings became a record of the many opposing ideas with which the Restoration struggled. The benefit of returning to his major works lies first in understanding how one thinker of the period hoped to restore political order to France, and, second, understanding what were some of the major issues of the

day.

Many historians have sought to place Chateaubriand in context with his time. It is a difficult task, for his ideas may be treated selectively, causing the reader to see him at one moment as a reactionary, at another as a moderate in support of constitutional government. In a sense, none of these interpretations are wrong: rather, they reveal the true Chateaubriand, who was comfortable with his eclectic vision.

One historian, B.D.Gooch, wrote that he was a romantic and practical man, while "at the same time he was both Ultraroyalist and liberal." [2] Dominique Bagge called him an Ultra-royalist under a parliamentary banner, and that his major work, Le Monarchie selon la Charte, was beautiful but without conviction. [3] Louis XVIII's biographer, Philip Mansel, argued that he was a moderate politician who became a violent Ultra in 1815, [4] while Nora Hudson thought he adopted an intermediate position which incurred the criticism of the extremists. [5] And finally, one important

2. B.D. Gooch, Europe in the Nineteenth Century [London: Rainbow-Bridge Book Co., 1970], p.142.

3. Dominique Bagge, Les idées politiques en France sous la Restauration [New York: Arno Press, 1979; reprint of the 1952 ed.], p.168.

4. Philip Mansel, Louis XVIII [London: Blond & Briggs, 1981], p.344.

5. Nora E. Hudson, Ultra-Royalism and the French Restoration [New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1973; reprint of the 1936 ed.], p.43.

4
historian, Roger Soltau, failed to mention Chateaubriand at all, despite his popularity and leadership in the Restoration.[6]

Clearly, these varying interpretations suggest that his ideas were too eclectic to be easily categorized. They also point to the difficulty of defining the different schools of thought in the Restoration. A royalist was fundamentally one who believed in the importance of a hereditary monarchy, specifically the Bourbon line; religion and tradition were also trademarks of a royalist's position. The other school, broadly speaking, was the liberal, distinguished by its support of constitutional government and the progressive ideas of representative government promoted by the Revolution. Obviously, these categories were somewhat artificial: within each there were different interpretations, and often there were similarities between the two. Chateaubriand was an excellent example of this connection between the two basic political views of the Restoration.

It is not the purpose of this study, however, to reach a definition of royalism or of liberalism, nor to outline the political history of the period. Rather, the intention here is to examine Chateaubriand's political theory from 1814 to 1820, with the hope of better understanding how one

6. Roger Henry Soltau, French Political Thought in the 19th Century[New York: Russell & Russell, 1959.]

participant viewed his age and the problems it confronted. While referring to some valuable secondary sources, the study will rely primarily upon Chateaubriand's own contributions, using his major political tracts and selected journalistic efforts.

Chapter I

Chateaubriand's Political Associations

The political situation immediately after the initial fall of Napoleon in 1814, was for Chateaubriand distinct from the experiences of the majority of those strongly identified with the Royalist cause. These included major groups. One was the circle of emigre royalists, whose general outlook remained largely anathema to the very idea of the Revolution itself. The second was the camp of extremists closely connected to the Count of Artois, whose idea of Restoration was consistently antagonistic to anything but a full return of the old monarchical principles. And the third group was composed of Royalist conspirators, known as the "Chevaliers de la Foi" (Knights of the Faith) who displayed a rigid, secretive hierarchy intent on the spreading of propaganda for the return of the Bourbon line.[7] All of these groups, loosely defined, would had only partially attracted the attention of Chateaubriand.

Chateaubriand's emigre experience, which took him to

7. De Bertier, The Restoration, ch. 1, passim.

7

America, to London and various amorous adventures, and finally to witness the sufferings of his family in the Terror, was not closely tied to those of his fellow emigres. If one examines his actions during the youthful period following his travels to America, there will be discovered only a peripheral involvement in emigre affairs, for instance in his joining the exile army at Coblenz in 1792, an exercise he himself characterized as folly. His Memoirs reveal, in fact, that this ragtag band seemed to him "honorable and touching....It presented the spectacle of the old monarchy and afforded a last glimpse of a dying world"[8] - hardly the stuff of inspired Royalist loyalty.

Little evidence can be found that the author of the Genius of Christianity had more than a passing interest in the ambitions and passions of the more extreme wing of Bourbon defenders, specifically the London emigres who rallied around the Count of Artois' efforts to reinstate the Bourbon monarchy.[9] The murder of the Duke of Enghien, in 1804, led Chateaubriand to break with Napoleon, who previously had made the author secretary to the embassy in Rome. It was Chateaubriand's horror of Napoleon's treachery which forced him to react decisively against the Emperor. His lengthy account of Enghien's arrest and murder, retold

8. Chateaubriand, Memoirs, trans., A.T. de Mattos, 6 vols.[London: 1902], v.2, p.38.

9. Vincent W. Beach, Charles X of France: His Life and Times[Boulder, Colorado: Pruett Publishing Company, 1971], ch.3, passim.

in his Memoirs, provided a portrait of a novelist's fondness for drama and suffering. His emphasis was on the heroic character of the Duke, and the tyrannical thirst for blood in Napoleon's ambitions.[10]

This emphasis was of utmost concern, for it showed already, long before the possible return of Louis XVIII, that Chateaubriand was more concerned with the evils generated by despotism than the fortunes to be wished for in the memory of the Bourbons. While his contact with emigre circles was at best limited, he had virtually no association with the Count of Artois, nor with Artois' brother, Louis XVIII. Neither figure appears directly in his general correspondence,[11] and of any contact with the Royal circle, prior to 1814, he has this to say in his Memoirs:

I had been presented to the King's brother [Artois]; he had been given my pamphlet to read, otherwise he would not have known my name: he remembered to have seen me neither at the Court of Louis XVI, nor at the Camp of Thionville, and he had doubtless never heard speak of the Genie du Christianisme. [12]

Chateaubriand may have been disappointed with this lack of recognition, but his statement clearly establishes his distance from the royal circle. A third group with which Chateaubriand may have had some contact was the "Chevaliers

10. Memoirs, v.2, pp.256ff.

11. Correspondance générale, vols.1 & 2 Paris:Gallimard, 1977.

12. Memoirs,v.3, pp.76-77.

9

de la Foi," whose leader, Ferdinand de Bertier, insisted on secrecy, obedience, fidelity to God, honor, king, and country. It was an association which may well have colored his vision of the Restoration. De Bertier says that, "There seem to be significant indications that Chateaubriand was also a member of the order." [13] Yet Chateaubriand makes no mention of it in his Memoirs, a deletion, perhaps, occasioned by his unwillingness to appear compromised by such an association; nor is there reference to the order in his correspondence. One can make no greater assumption than that he was attracted, if at all, more by the romantic notion of a heroic, knightly order than by the stern commitment of its faith. The lack of attention given by Chateaubriand to the group, it seems, was one more example of his distance from the organized royalist groups.

Notably, these assertions about Chateaubriand, that he had little substantial connection with organized Royalist activists, force us to recognize that at the center of his conception of governmental authority and power was not a naive belief in the sanctity of the monarchic system, but a fear of the abuses of power, as manifested in the extremes of Revolution, Terror, and above all, Napoleon's arbitrary and capricious use of authority.

It was the Revolution and Terror, after all, which had forced Chateaubriand and hundreds of royalist supporters

13. De Bertier, The Restoration, p.15

into exile, which led to his witnessing of suffering and execution, and his feverish desire to combat excesses of political fanaticism. It was Napoleon who had recognized Chateaubriand's talents and brought him into his administration. His new-found respectability surely must have allowed a measure of gratefulness to the Emperor, and yet with the murder of the Duke of Enghien, this weak affection was entirely destroyed. Again, it was as witness to excess, not as one concerned solely with the return of a monarchic line, that he formed the basis of his political creed.

Chapter II

The Intentions of Des Buonaparte et des Bourbons

In April, 1814, in the last days of Napoleon's rule, Chateaubriand succeeded in publishing his famous pamphlet, Des Buonaparte et des Bourbons.^[14] It caused an immediate sensation in France; Louis XVIII is said to have remarked - so Chateaubriand reminds us - that the work was more powerful than an army of one hundred thousand men, and Napoleon himself was impressed, if indeed we are to believe Chateaubriand.^[15] The importance of the work for public opinion lies in its timeliness, its relentless quarrel with all that Napoleon stood for, and the enthusiasm with which he welcomed the Bourbons. It marked for the author, as well, an emergence into the political limelight, comparable to his reception in literary circles with his earlier successes.

Des Buonaparte et des Bourbons, issued in the midst of political confusion and military defeat, certainly led opinion to see the author placed squarely in the Royalist camp. It is still one of the most important documents of

14. Des Buonaparte et des Bourbons[Paris: 1814].

15. Memoirs, v.3, pp.65-66.

the early Restoration, primarily because of its delineation of the negative aspects of Napoleonic rule, as well for the convenience with which Royalists then and later could point to the legitimacy of Bourbon rule. Its importance for us, however, lies in a closer examination of its principles, revealing the inherent tensions of the return of the old Monarchy.

Chateaubriand wasted no time in presenting his most basic concerns: religion, nationalism, and especially liberty. The hand of Providence, he wrote, is present in all that has happened, and Napoleon is without asylum. With Napoleon, the fatherland was brought to ruin; still, one word lives, Liberty, which is not of itself responsible for the crimes of the past: "La liberté ne doit point être accusée des forfaits que l'on commit sous son nom." [16] In sudden, sweeping terms, Chateaubriand laid the foundations for his later, theoretical distinctions from the traditional views of the Ultras: one need not use the Revolutionary Trinity, Egalité, Fraternité, Liberté, but Liberté cannot be compromised. Thus he started a theme which he often tried to reconcile with his vision of the organic French nation.

It must be remarked, however, that this pamphlet was emotional and perhaps even confused. His argument revealed the character of a man obsessed with deposing the great emperor, the first necessary step in restoring any sort of

 16. Des Buonaparte et des Bourbons, pp.1-2.

stability and tradition to French society. Furthermore, there was a personal element to be admitted: he must have seen his political future, and reputation, tied to the success of his writing. Beyond financial gain and the possibility of a political position, he saw in his faithful projects the chance for being awarded the Cross of Saint-Louis, and the military grade of colonel.[17]

No doubt, the opportunity to sing the virtues of an old-regime France gave Chateaubriand ample room to imagine an order of life distinguished by the spiritual nature of the French people. Napoleon's reign brought an end to the customs and spirit of France: "In the name of (Napoleon's) law, religion and morality were overthrown." [18]

Reminiscent of Burke's attack on the French Revolution, Chateaubriand decried the renunciation of "the experience and the customs of our fathers." It was, in a sense, as organic conception of traditional society as that evoked by Burke; it countered the legalistic, artificial state to historically evolved society, yet it offered no evidence of historical detail to substantiate its argument. The newly created, newly ordered state, consolidated by Napoleon, became a society founded on uncertain reason, "sans passé et sans avenir." [19] It was not explained, however, just what

17. Chateaubriand, Correspondance générale, v.2, letter no. 649, 3 July 1814, pp.211-212.

18. Des Buonaparte et des Bourbons, p.2.

19. Ibid.

marked this so-called traditional society; religion and morality were insufficient terms for historic definition. Chateaubriand used this vague historic past simply as a means to erase any claim of Napoleonic legitimacy.

The attack on Napoleon's rule also contained a curious reference to having created a society "without past and without future." The past, indeed, was denied by the Emperor, but also by the Revolution. Napoleonic "despotism" usurped religion and arbitrarily forfeited liberty, under the false nationalism of a foreigner who deceived the French people; the use of the spelling of Napoleon's name was quite purposeful, noting the Corsican's foreign blood, a jab which some translators have inexplicably overlooked.[20] But what of the "future" which Napoleon was accused of having rejected? Nothing of the future of the old regime was explained, but worse still, Napoleon, who disavowed the past, could provide only an interminable present, without hope, with his vain, censorial regime. Again, Chateaubriand was unconcerned with establishing a solid historical vision, intent only upon tracing the tragedy of France to Napoleon.

The immediate power of Des Buonaparte et des Bourbons was in its description of the betrayal of the French race. "Chaque nation a ses vices. Ceux des Francais ne sont pas

20. For instance, the translator of the Memoirs leaves the spelling "Bonaparte."

21. Des Buonaparte et des Bourbons, p.7.

la trahison, la noirceur, et l'ingratitude." [21] Napoleon's genius lay in his subtle rise to power; deception and personal interest were his trademarks. Chateaubriand feared the ignorance of those born after the Revolution, that they did not know France's ancient rulers, but saw only the troubles and misfortunes of the past. These youth, along with the naive Republicans and Royalists who welcomed him, were trounced by his true ambitions. [22] The time would come, Chateaubriand hoped, when the French would freely declare that they had nothing to do with Napoleon's inglorious heritage.

The use of police oppression to force the French into submission was the hallmark of Napoleon's domestic politics; a good administrator, yes, but of the necessities of life, respect for rights, property, family, etc., his government was the worst. [23] In foreign policy, not victories but the conscription will stand as the greatest symbol of his rule. [24] More notable for the modern student, having witnessed the methods of the totalitarian state, was the "Orwellian double-speak" of Napoleon's rule, the abuse of language for state authority:

Alors commencèrent les grandes Saturnales de la royauté: les crimes, l'oppression, l'esclavage marchèrent d'un pas égal avec la folie. Toute liberté expire, tout sentiment honorable, toute

22. Ibid, pp.3-4.

23. Ibid., pp.8-11.

24. Ibid., pp.14ff.

pensée généreuse deviennent des conspirations contre l'Etat. Si on parle de vertu, on est suspect; louer une belle action, c'est une injure faite au prince. Les mots changent d'acception: un peuple qui combat pour ses souverains légitimes est un peuple rebelle; un traître est un sujet fidèle; la France entière devient l'empire du mensonge: journaux, pamphlets, discours, prose et vers, tout déguise la vérité.[25]

Without the prescience of a wider-ranging mind, Chateaubriand still was able to understand the methods of Napoleon, by which contrary opinions were reduced to impotence.

In a summation of Napoleon's evil, in which Chateaubriand addresses him in the personal, and provocative, "tu", the Emperor was responsible for destroying all of France's greatness. The people wanted a monarchy founded on the bases of equality of rights, of morality, of civil liberty, of political and religious toleration. Instead he gave them impious war, the imprisonment of the Pope, the murder of the Duke of Enghien. He lost colonies, commerce, opened America to the English. Who corrupted French customs, took children from their parents, devastated families, ravaged the mind, inspired horror in the name of France throughout the world? It was Napoleon. Behind the mask of Caesar and Alexander, he made of France a ruined country.[26]

Such are the words, Chateaubriand wrote, with which we

25. Ibid., pp.7-8.

26. Ibid., pp.27-31.

must address Buonaparte. But, he added, if we reject Napoleon, who shall replace him? It was, obviously, the King, yet not so evident were the reasons for the choice. Chateaubriand spent the majority of his pamphlet vilifying the Emperor; here lay the burden of his propaganda. The French had to re-learn the truth of their rightful inheritance, not be swayed by the foreign usurper. It was not just a despot they were to reject, however, nor was it simply a Bourbon monarch they were to welcome: the King represented in his title the idea of legitimate authority, of order, peace, and legal and monarchic liberty.[27] In replacing one form of rule with another, Chateaubriand was seeking not to merely elevate a royal person to power, but to restore above all else the ideas of legitimacy.

In this we find an emphasis easily overlooked by those who call Chateaubriand a typical Royalist. His language was distinct: the King must represent the truths of his people, but it is not as a leader with absolute power that he will rule. "Les fonctions attachées à ce titre sont si connues de Français, qu'ils n'ont pas besoin de se le faire expliquer." [28] It was in the best interests of the people that the King rule, but one may also assume, conversely, that the King would lose his legitimacy if he did not fulfill his functions. This distinction, loosely applied in

27. Ibid., p.31.

28. Ibid.

the pamphlet, arose again when Chateaubriand differed with the King and his ministry on the duties of his mission.

The enthusiasm of Chateaubriand calling back the legitimate Monarch was subtly tempered by the role he was to play. France, misled by Napoleon, confused the proper role of a ruler:

Le roi, le magistrat, le père; un Français confond ces idées. Il ne sait ce que c'est qu'un empereur; il ne connaît pas la nature, la forme, la limite du pouvoir attaché à ce titre étranger. Mais il sait ce que c'est qu'un monarque descendant de saint Louis et de Henri IV: c'est un chef dont la puissance paternelle est réglée par des institutions, tempérée par le temps, comme un vin généreux, né de la terre de la patrie, et mûri par le soleil de la France.[29]

Only a ruler blessed with the true blood of France, not Napoleon's foreign blood, was capable of bringing to the nation the virtues Chateaubriand extolled. And a Bourbon, descended from the noble heritage of Saint-Louis and Henri IV, inherited the experience of centuries, of adversity and glory, and would bring to France the greatness she once enjoyed. Were this misty idolatry not proof enough (and it really was not, of course), Chateaubriand outlined Louis' fitting qualities:

Non-seulement Louis XVIII a ces idées fixes, cette modération, ce bon sens si nécessaires à un monarque, mais c'est encore un prince ami des lettres, instruit et éloquent comme plusieurs de nos rois, d'un esprit vaste et éclairé, d'un caractère ferme et philosophiques.[30]

29. Ibid., p.32.

30. Ibid., p.34

No doubt this passage, lifted out of context, could be construed as a complete endorsement of the Bourbon return under Louis XVIII. But there was a clear, if subtle limitation in the midst of this otherwise rosy picture:

De tous les souverains qui peuvent gouverner à présent la France, d'est peut-être celui qui convient le mieux à notre position et à l'esprit du siècle....Les institutions des peuples sont l'ouvrage du temps et de l'expérience: pour régner il faut surtout de la raison et de l'uniformité.[31]

Chateaubriand envisioned Louis XVIII as a wise, tolerant king, willing to forgive the nation its crimes. Above all, he would guarantee the stability which was forfeited in the upheavals of the past quarter century.

Chateaubriand, of course, continued to praise Louis XVIII as this most fitting King. Evidently there must have been pressure upon the author (possibly financial, or his own desire to be accepted), to make this pamphlet pleasing to the most likely group to come into power, the Royalists. Thus his warning was, albeit gentle, nevertheless clearly pronounced. A more conservative Royalist would have shuddered to see Chateaubriand betray the royal heritage. Would it not be blasphemy to suggest that the king be limited by institutions, especially those forged in the recent past, the Revolution? That would mean that to accept the King, one would as well be forced, at least implicitly,

to accept the Revolution! And yet it was quite clear that Chateaubriand called for the King to be wed with the spirit of the century. Certainly not, he argued emphatically, could the French accept the foreign dictator; but what then was it to accept the times? It meant clearly, although the language was somewhat euphemistic, to concede to the basic reality of the Revolution.

Unlike Burke, whose attack on the Revolution was explicit and fundamental - "To make a revolution is to subvert the ancient state of our country; and no common reasons are called for to justify so violent a proceeding " [32] - Chateaubriand seemed ambiguous about the nature and justification of 1789. Whereas Burke abhorred the reckless intervention of man into the natural order of society, Chateaubriand was willing to see revolution, particularly the French Revolution, as part of the inevitable course of history. As Paul Beik has written, "One can see that he inclined toward the Greek view (of history), however, and that for him the laws of nature made for cyclical change rather than for evolution upwards." [33] This allowed him a relatively dispassionate perspective on the causes of the Revolution, one certain to receive little goodwill from its orthodox critics. It also offered him the

 32. Edmund Burke, Reflections on the Revolution in France, and Thomas Paine, The Rights of Man, [New York: Doubleday & Co., 1961], p.181.

33. Paul H. Beik, The French Revolution Seen From the Right, [New York: Howard Fertig, 1970], p.86.

ability to see the French Revolution from both sides. In a footnote to his section on the "Encyclopédistes," in his Essai historique of 1797, he provided this assessment of the philosophes' culpability:

Qu'il soit bien entendu qu'ils n'en sont pas la seule cause, mais une grande cause. La révolution française ne vient point de tel ou tel homme, de tel ou tel livre: elle vient des choses. Elle était inévitable; c'est ce que mille gens ne veulent pas se persuader. Elle provient surtout du progrès de la société à la fois vers les lumières et vers la corruption; c'est pourquoi on remarque dans la révolution française tant d'excellents principes et de conséquences funestes. Les premiers dérivent d'une théorie éclairée; les secondes, de la corruption des mœurs.[34]

The Revolution could not be denied, therefore, although one had to condemn its extreme results. Chateaubriand had in mind the sufferings of his own family, as well as the many others caught up in the Terror. The worst of these was Napoleon's conquest of power and his degradation of the French spirit. But in calling back the Bourbons, Chateaubriand did not pretend to condone the realities of the Ancien Regime. In Des Buonaparte et des Bourbons, he said nothing of the corruption of French customs or the failures of the Monarchy. His Essai historique was written in a counter-revolutionary spirit, yet he also felt a strong revulsion for the new society it had created. The most admirable aspect of the Revolution, however, was its idealism; and though he did not reveal any

34. Essai historique, in Oeuvres Complètes, v. 13 [Paris: 1852], p.233n.

great optimism for their possible fulfillment, he does see in the ideas of the time a possible regeneration.[35] It was a sense of emptiness which the Revolution attempted to overcome. To go back to the Ancien Regime, then, would be an exercise in futility.

At best, as Beik argues, Chateaubriand's so-called traditionalism was one of despair.[36] He saw in Napoleon's rule a final loss of the nation's true spirit. The Restoration was not meant to be a return to the order of the past, but a rebirth of the French spirit. In this, the Bourbons were the most representative of the highest claims of all that was good through the centuries; but he also understood that this was a spiritual return, not a reversion to the corruption, narrow-mindedness, and emptiness that brought on the Revolution.

Behind the laudatory language of Des Buonaparte et des Bourbons, which was to the royalists its most estimable aspect, one senses that Chateaubriand recognized that the Restoration could be the only course open to France. The only type of rule able to restore the natural French love for religion, national pride, and liberty was that expressed in the inherited wisdom and paternalism of the Bourbons. There was a strong hope here that the Bourbon line was capable of such a task, but there was, it seems, a caution.

35. Beik, Revolution Seen From the Right, pp.87-89.

36. Ibid., p.90.

It was Chateaubriand's insistence on Liberty (a term not adequately defined in the pamphlet), a right of the French which had to be respected by the king. The circumstances of publishing and having the work accepted by Royalist circles certainly prevented Chateaubriand from outlining what he intended precisely, for it would have lost its most basic appeal, a call for unified support for the Restoration. When Chateaubriand proclaims, "Vive le Roi," it is only an initial sanction; the complexity of the slogan is surely not lost on the author.

A final section of the pamphlet added still further to understanding the complications of the Restoration. It was the appeal to the Allies to support the Bourbon return. Once again, he began by attacking Napoleon, defiling his dishonest and cavalier conquest of Europe. But the tenor of his writing shifted slightly from the praise with which he welcomed the Bourbons and extolled the French race, to one of political expediency. Obviously Chateaubriand could not argue that to revive the claims of national pride would be beneficial to the Allies. His encouragement for their support of the Restoration rested largely on the practicality which would serve their interests.

As de Bertier writes, of the Allies' demands, Chateaubriand was not unique in demanding the overthrow of Napoleon. The Allied Sovereigns, in their manifesto of December 1, 1813, declared that they "are not waging war against France....They are only warring against the Emperor,

or rather against that preponderance which he has too long exercised beyond his empire to the detriment of France and Europe." [37] But if there was consensus on deposing the Emperor, it was lacking in the Allies' plans for choosing a successor. England's opinion on the subject conformed most directly to Chateaubriand's, [38] and he recognized the need to persuade the rest of the European coalition through his propaganda.

The Allies demanded that for the Bourbons to be acceptable, the French people had to show their approval. Chateaubriand's pamphlet (sub-titled specifically not only for rallying the French, but also all of the European powers around the Bourbon Restoration), appealed first to the French for their natural goodness, then to the Allies for their natural good sense. Only with a Bourbon on the throne would the French people be once more happy, and the Allies expect the stability and peace of ruling Europe alongside a truly legitimate Monarch. It was the same argument as throughout the work: Louis represented the glory and sensibility of centuries of French leadership, and this inheritance shared the same traditions and customs as the rest of the legitimate Europe sovereigns. The fear of a foreigner whose usurpation of power brought Europe almost to ruin did not apply to "brothers united by the Christian

37. De Bertier, The Restoration, p.18.

38. Ibid., pp.19-20.

religion and their ancient memories." [39] The Allies, after²⁵ all, were France's liberators, not her conquerors; they recognized the true French from the Usurper.

Addressing the Allies, Chateaubriand's argument had a tone of almost simple practicality, with an additional bit of reverence for good measure. It was the French people, however, whom he saw as most in need of moderation, and probably limited, by experience, in restoring unity to the nation. If Chateaubriand's traditionalism, as has been said, was one of despair, his final words hinted at the same sense, that simply restoring the monarchy would not by itself heal France's wounds:

Français! amis, compagnons d'infortune, oublions nos querelles, nos haines, nos erreurs, pour sauver la patrie; embrassons-nous sur les ruines de notre cher pays.... Songeons que tous les maux que nous éprouvons... sont l'ouvrage d'un seul homme. Faisons donc entendre de toutes parts le cri qui peut nous sauver, le cri que nos pères faisoient retentir dans le malheur comme dans la victoire, et qui sera pour nous le signal de la paix et du bonheur: Vive le Roi! [40]

Nowhere, perhaps, can one turn to find a more devastating account of Napoleonic "despotism," yet behind its impassioned rhetoric the pamphlet was hardly a masterpiece of political theory. Its author seemed only to have grasped the broad outlines of legitimacy, and injected into them the feverish impulses of the moment. In 1814, at least, such writing was enough to create certain celebrity.

39. Des Buonaparte et des Bourbons, p.43.

40. Ibid., p.46.

Chapter III

The Limitations of Political Authority

Judging by this analysis of Des Buonaparte et des Bourbons, Chateaubriand's Royalism was based on Monarchic legitimacy, but with restrictions built into the King's role. Nothing concrete was mentioned of his support for constitutional government, although the concept of Liberty, vaguely outlined, stood out clearly. Liberty and Monarchy, two ideas with possibly contradictory implications, therefore, formed the basis of his vision of the proper order.

Des Buonaparte et des Bourbons was an emotionally charged political tract; it lacked a tempered analysis, which evidently did not take away from its overall popularity. Its eloquence made up for its analytical shortcomings. In fact, as C.T. Muret has written, "Chateaubriand was neither a philosopher nor a statesman; he

was a poet who had wandered into politics. The source of his ideas was emotional rather intellectual, and he was both royalist and liberal from sentiment more than from philosophic conviction." [1] His political theory might have remained vague and unconvincing were it not for De la Monarchie selon la Charte. [2] Many of his political writings revolved around immediate circumstances; [3] in this work, however, he presented his comprehensive theory of government. It was, to be sure, substantially still a Royalist tract, but Chateaubriand prefaced it by explaining that the word "royalist" was intended to embrace all the royalists. He recognized, just as he did in Des Buonaparte et des Bourbons, the divisions among those who favored the return of the monarchy. Though the work is not one of penetrating insight - one commentator has written that Chateaubriand lacked originality but not relevance [4] - it is generally considered one of the most influential writings of the period, and succeeded in placing the author in the forefront of Royalism, even among those who worried that the arguments were too liberal.

From the very beginning, Chateaubriand tried to appeal

1. C.T. Muret, French Royalist Doctrines since the Revolution [New York: Columbia University Press, 1933], p.35.

2. N.B., separate edition of the Oeuvres complètes, [Bruxelles, 1835], v.26.

3. See, for example, his Opinions et Discours and Polémique.

4. E. Beau de Loménie, La carrière politique de Chateaubriand, de 1814 à 1830 [Paris: Plon, 1929], II: p.354.

to French practicality; common sense, he wrote, is a thing more rare than its good name suggests. The Revolution, and all the chaos that surrounded it, forced the French to forget their proper sensibility. Nonetheless, the nation inherited a new system, established by the Charter, which based representative government on four parts: the Royalty (or Royal prerogative), the Chamber of Peers, the Chamber of Deputies, and the Ministry (later we shall see that he might have included the press as well, for its role was crucial in a representative system). The fundamental principle of the constitutional, Royal prerogative was that nothing proceeds directly from the King in the actual acts of government, but that everything is the work of the Ministry. The King is sacred and inviolable, in fact infallible, and if there is error it is the fault of the Ministry.[5]

The implication of this approach was crucial. We have seen that in Des Buonaparte et des Bourbons Chateaubriand conceived of the king's role as a symbolic one; he represents the true spirit of the French, its past and its ancient truths, but this does not give the king any type of absolute power. Because mistakes will be made in governing, the king, by his very nature sacred and inviolable, must be protected. The Royalty must be preserved at all cost. Thus Chateaubriand carried his abstract notion of the King, and the even more abstract notion of the French spirit, into the

very workings of government.

A Royalist would have said that the King is above responsibility; but because he relied on this abstract, hazy vision of the King and his people to support his fundamental beliefs, Chateaubriand worked himself into an obvious - and, for a political theorist, embarrassing - contradiction. For if the King is infallible, why should he not make the rules? The Count of Artois might have found this a pleasant possibility, but Chateaubriand, suspicious of any singular consolidation of power, stopped short of any claim to absolute sovereignty.

The real model for this monarchic rule was closer to the English system than to that proposed by his more conservative counterparts: the monarch, in essence, reigns but does not govern. It was a Royalism inspired by the pleasant vision of the King as a wise, paternal sovereign, uniting in his title all the needs and gifts of the nation, at the very least reminding the French that they are a united nation based on worthy traditions. Yet it was also restrained by pessimism, a distrust of excess power and the abuse of accountability. To lose a Monarch by his own excesses, which absolute sovereignty invites, would be to shatter the fragile stability of the nation. Even in England, Chateaubriand wrote, all harmony is lost if even the King's name is invoked in debates in Parliament.[6]

6. Ibid., p.11.

It is important here to mention an objection to Chateaubriand's perceived role as a leader of the Ultra-Royalist group, and the larger purpose of writing his pamphlet. General misconceptions have plagued secondary interpretations by not drawing attention to the complexity of his suggestions. For instance, the excellent work by René Rémond argues clearly that Chateaubriand was a leader of the Ultras, without mentioning that it was the Ultras who adopted, quite selectively, some of his slogans.[7] Or turn to the helpful study by C.T. Muret, which states that the Ultras "adopted the liberal theory of the responsibility of ministers to the parliamentary majority, in order to force their will upon the king. Chateaubriand was in full agreement with these views." [8] Indeed, Chateaubriand demanded ministerial responsibility, but only as long as it was intended, ultimately, to uphold the Charter.

Certainly, the Ultras echoed many of Chateaubriand's views. But the purpose in publishing De la Monarchie selon la Charte was not to callously abuse the Charter for elitist, reactionary ends. He believed deeply in its necessity as a tool for modern government. As we have seen, Chateaubriand was suspicious of political power, whether it be the fanaticism of groups, as in the Revolution, or the

7. René Rémond, The Right Wing in France, from 1815 to de Gaulle [Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1966], p.37.

8. Muret, French Royalist Doctrines, p.39.

single-handed manipulations of Napoleon's rule. Although he wished to make some changes in the Charter's lesser rules, he was convinced that it was to be the fundamental safeguard of the liberties of the French.

The social situation which Chateaubriand alluded to, the almost pastoral nature of French society in a properly-ordered state, was far from an egalitarian, democratic state. His idea of Liberty was defensive, protective of basic claims to human dignity.. He did not promote "progressive" ideas which sought in the idea of Liberty fundamental changes in the social order. He was not closed to change, however; rather, he opposed excessive power in any direction. In this way, the liberals could, by excising some of the more objectionable language, find much to agree with in the pamphlet.

Just as the royalists claimed aspects of Chateaubriand's thought, so, too, could members of the opposition to the "Chambre Introuvable" adapt certain ideas. Such adaptability, as well as the power and often basic common sense of his writing, created a crossing of lines, and blurred the distinctions which might have made Chateaubriand a more easily categorized figure. It also, unfortunately, lowered his stock as a consistent and predictable party leader. De Bertier is correct in asserting that Chateaubriand wished for a royalist majority in Parliament, but its ultimate purpose was to be different than what the core of the Royalists wanted. Even de Bertier

admits, after all, that "the party considered Viscount Bonald (a reactionary who found nothing legitimate in France's Revolutionary heritage) to be their real spokesman, and he considered the Charter to be a work of 'folly and darkness'." [9]

One may look upon Chateaubriand's goals as somewhat politically naive, considering that he stuck to his moderate royalist principles while many of the royalists themselves differed in many real ways. It was perhaps more reflective of his pessimism, however, that he saw the true interests of France protected in the history and traditions of the most responsible class, which the Royalists comprised, even if they would have to grudgingly accept the inevitable spirit of the new century. He was no more willing to compromise his support of the Charter than he was to accept a France governed by atheists, democrats, or regicides.

A good example of both the immediacy and subtlety of De la Monarchie selon la Charte was his support of the open initiative in Parliament. A conservative royalist might have supposed that it was an attack against the powers of the Ministry, which in part it was. But can we assume that was all it stood for? Chateaubriand felt that the Ministry should be held accountable for the errors of decision in the executive branch, for obvious reasons. The king must be protected from the scandals which the Ministry had created

in its policies. Primarily, these revolved around the sale of national forests, which the royalists intended to return to the Church; the dissolution of the "Chambre Introuvable," which was a legally constituted majority in Parliament, and thus the Ministry's action was illegal, and immoral; and by the general attempts to usurp power, especially the actions of Decazes, the minister of police, in his intrigues in Louis' court. In these matters, Chateaubriand was in full accord with the Royalist majority.[10]

His inspiration in publishing the pamphlet was more complex, however, than a simple royalist reaction to the offensive actions of this particular Ministry. He believed strongly that the conspiracies of Decazes threatened not just the wishes of the majority, but the nature of representative government as well:

La proposition secrète de la loi ne peut même jamais être si secrète qu'elle ne parvienne au public, défigurée: l'initiative franche est de la nature du gouvernement représentatif.[11]

Furthermore, to renounce the majority, he wrote, was to shatter the great jurisdiction of representative government. Certainly, it can be argued that Chateaubriand was defending the interests of the majority; his language emphasized, however, the need to transcend particular issues, to maintain a vision of proper government:

10. Ibid., pp.136-39.

11. De la Monarchie selon la Charte, p.15.



I had resisted the seizure of the Monarchie selon la Charte to enlighten misled royalty, and to uphold the liberty of thought and of the press; I had frankly embraced our institutions, and I remained loyal to them.[12]

The institutions to which Chateaubriand referred were noticeably restricted to the balance of forces between the Chambers, the King, and the Ministry, as well as the press, which was also a contributing force to harmony. The changes the Charter allowed, and which the Ministry was taking in its own direction, prompted Chateaubriand to express his fears about the impending destruction of representative government. He favored a vigorous role for the Chamber of Peers, in part because it most conformed to France's true nature, but also because of the dangers an irresponsible Ministry and a powerful Chamber of Deputies would create.[13] The implicit suspicion of the Chamber of Deputies, though not openly defined, rested on the association of its aims with those of self-aggrandizing politicians, for whom the future of France was of little concern. And the Ministers were no different.

The French genius was outside of the Chamber of Deputies and the Ministry. It was symbolized in the Monarchy, sustained by the Peers of France, and most threatened by the selfish men who claimed to speak for the people, and who turned Louis' ear the wrong way. The

12. Memoirs, v.4, p.11.

13. De la Monarchie selon la Charte, pp.26-27.

Charter was to protect this delicate balance: we must make use of this Charter, Chateaubriand wrote, if we don't then French genius is incompatible with representative government.[14] Again, the fear was expressed that abuse of power was to be expected in the conspiratorial aims of the Ministry:

La force d'un ministre françois n'est pas seulement dans son cabinet: elle est aussi dans son salon.[15]

Under no circumstances was a minister to be trusted, especially when it came to influencing public opinion.

His most consistently expressed fear was that public opinion could be distorted if there was no true freedom of the press. It was Chateaubriand's opinion that the journals represented the reality of public opinion, the right of dissent from governmental action. In fact, the press was so important that it could be considered a tribunal, just as a Deputy was a tribune; this confirmed the interpretation that he saw the press as a fifth organ of government. It was a logical argument, but it raised a curious and difficult suggestion: Chateaubriand argued that just as a Deputy must meet a certain financial requirement to sit in the Chamber, so too must a journal meet requirements. He called for a thousand-franc deposit for all journals, which would assure that the press was responsible to public opinion. There was

14. Ibid., p.30.

15. Ibid., p.54.

an obvious dilemma which Chateaubriand passed over, namely, that a required deposit provided opportunity for censorship. Deciding what was in the best interest of public opinion was an arbitrary a form of control. In fact, "public opinion" was another unclarified idea useful to Chateaubriand as a means of arguing that whoever the opponent may be, was out of step with the truth.

It can be argued that Chateaubriand was caught up in the same feverish pitch of politics as the rest of the combatants in the battle for the Restoration. In many cases, irrationality, or a gap in logic, interrupted otherwise reasoned attempts to come to terms with the diverse forces of the period. The issue of a press law confounded most theorists trying to reconcile a free press with the demands of public morality and safety. He was not alone, therefore, in wrestling with the complicated issue. On a broader level, shortsightedness and reaction to immediate circumstances forced a more notorious reversal of logic, when in the debate on the Amnesty Law, the Liberals defended the Royal prerogative "and the Ultra-royalists became the champions of parliamentary authority." [16] Such a contradiction can only be understood in light of the dangers which all sides saw in any movements of their political enemies.

In a political situation in which all factions see the

16. Ibid., p.135.

moment as a critical turning point for the future, inconsistency is bound to play a role, and extremism, often deplored by all sides in more harmonious times, is justified as a necessary resort. There is nothing inevitable in politics, and this applies to the Restoration: the force of circumstance in a volatile time often carries the day. Neither the left nor the right exclusively planted the seeds for the fall of the Bourbon line. Unfortunately, the most salutary aspects of De la Monarchie selon la Charte could not heal the divisions in France, and Chateaubriand's impassioned pleas suffered the same fate as moderation often does in times of crisis. With so much at stake, and so many opinions, one voice, determined to be fair, is easily overwhelmed.

Chapter IV

Le Conservateur, and the End of Moderation

Chateaubriand's moderation and independence of spirit never led him to abandon the Royalists in the political fight. He still showed a deep commitment to the idea of Monarchy, of tradition, of religion, and especially of the Charter. By 1818, however, after three years of political turmoil, his fears of the encroachment of Liberal ideology had become more pronounced. Most telling was his alarm at the success of liberal journals, such as the Quotidienne and the Constitutionnel, both which displayed vague Bonapartist tendencies. The influence of Bonapartist and Liberal ideas appeared to outweigh that of the Royalist press, and Chateaubriand responded by acting as an editor and contributor to the Conservateur.^[17] In his Memoirs he claimed the journal was of utmost importance to the royalist cause.^[18] His leadership, because of his brilliance and popularity, lent a great deal to its success. It was basically an Ultra organ, but his involvement kept it

17. Le Conservateur [Paris:1818-1820], 6 vols., issued irregularly.

18. Memoirs, v.4, pp.16-17.

strictly constitutional, and it succeeded in its primary mission, which is apparent in reviewing Chateaubriand's articles, in embarrassing the Ministry.[19]

A difference in tone emerged in his writing in the Conservateur: just as Des Buonaparte et des Bourbons was a vitriolic attack on the Emperor and a panegyric for the Monarchy, and De la Monarchie selon la Charte was a more analytical argument for constitutional, Royalist government, Chateaubriand focused specifically on the Ministry in moralizing, frantic condemnations. Frustration, fear, and finally a disgust with Louis' ministers informed most of his articles. The attacks were supported by urgent references to the purpose of the Charter. Throughout, his writings appeared to foreshadow his later, official break with the regime, but at least in the journal his warnings were articulated, devoid of his personal quarrels with the Ministry; and his faith in the Monarch still existed, though what Louis allowed strained the author's patience.

The first issue (5 October 1818) began with Chateaubriand's introduction and praise for the project being undertaken. Royalists of more conservative bent, whom he considered to be his good friends, would also participate in the journal's campaign, but immediately Chateaubriand informed his readers that constitutional government was the

19. Irene Collins, The Government and the Newspaper Press in France, 1814-1881 [London: Oxford University Press, 1959], pp.20-21.

overriding concern of Le Conservateur. We want nothing that is not constitutional, he wrote, "Nous voulons la Charte." And he sounded the call which was the journal's slogan for its entire existence: "Le Conservateur soutiendra la religion, le Roi, la liberté, la Charte et les honnêtes gens, ou ni moi ni mes amis ne pouvons nous y intéresser." [20] "Honnêtes gens" was not a term which referred to simple, acceptable virtue; it comprised a vision of the social and political order which transcended the base ambitions of the Ministry and the enemies of true representative government, by invoking the 17th Century notion of the term. Whereas in 1815 he had hoped to appeal to the good sense of anyone involved in government (recall, too, the note of pessimism which surfaced in his writing), it was now apparent that no hope remained for such a tactic. Only an attack on his enemies, comparable to his attack on Napoleon, would suffice. Chateaubriand now appealed only to his allies, the "honnêtes gens." Whatever sensibility existed could not be found in the Ministry. Already his moderation was waning: the sense that all factions might agree to unify for the sake of France had disappeared, and it was the fault of self-interested politicians. His opinion was that only the royalists, in their support of king, religion, liberty, and the Charter, wished to maintain representative government.

20. Le Conservateur, v.1, p.7.

Chateaubriand saw also another threat, perhaps sooner than many others recognized it, the abuse of the theory of Egalité. Equality was fine, of course, if it could only work, but it was being invoked as a dangerous political weapon, rather than as a sincere concern for all men. For all the supposed idealism of its advocates, they were no different than the men of '93, whose hypocritical love of liberty and equality came only from hatred and envy.[21] Hatred was the motivation of the Ministry and the enemies of Royalism; they were not to be associated with their claims to a better system.[22]

Three weeks later, and in succeeding articles, Chateaubriand began to express his fears more concretely. Not only did the Ministry hate the Royalists, it was attempting to gain greater power by enlarging the franchise, bringing France to the edge of Democracy. A century and a half later, such a fear would seem to many to reveal only the worst of reactionary instincts. But to Chateaubriand, such an accusation carried the most serious of dangers, the fear of the mob dictating its harmful ambitions.

If there was any constructive argument which came out of Chateaubriand's articles in the Conservateur, it appeared

21. Ibid., pp.40-41.

22. Ibid., p.15.

23. "De la Morale des interets et de celle des devoirs," v.1, no.10, Dec., 1818, pp.466-78.

in December, 1818.[23] Chateaubriand referred to it in his Memoirs as his most important contribution. The Ministry, he wrote, created a new morality, the morality of interests. Whereas the previous quarter-century staked its power on the loss of moral conscience and the spell of glory, the present Ministry based its claims on seduction. Nothing more dangerous could afflict France. "Duty" is what France was based on for fourteen centuries; the Eighteenth-century destroyed that, and now all motivation was based on "Interest," which changed its nature whenever it was to its immediate benefit. The morality of interests was anti-social, and that was what the children were now being taught. Only bad would come from their education in this life.

There was a glory which Chateaubriand emphasized in the idea of Duty. The man who fulfilled his Duty in times of the greatest challenge would gain esteem; the nation which did so would gain its greatest glory. People did not fight for abstract ideas and gain anything, unless it was out of sacrifice. The truth of society was not to be found outside of that sacred limit of Duty. And finally he offered his prophetic warning for those who would seek to continue the policies of the present: "With this profound policy, when the hour of devotion shall have come, each one will shut his door, go to the window, and watch the Monarchy pass." [24]

24. Ibid., p.478.

The argument he offered was his last really calm approach to the problems of the Restoration before the assassination of the Duke of Berry. Censorship of the press returned as the primary concern in most of his articles, and the attack on the Ministry remained the motif. There were some gems of journalistic propaganda in the articles; for instance, of the quality of the men now in government, he said, "These pygmies have stiffened their hold in order to support the colossal ruins under which they have been lodged." [25] But for the most part, Chateaubriand had entered into the Royalist camp and there seemed no return. The ministers, and his Liberal adversaries, probably would not have compromised with him anyway, having failed to read the moderation which he so wanted to guide the Restoration. But with his angry language, any cooperation was moribund.

The Conservateur was in many ways the last effort the Royalists were able to sustain in the hopes of possibly transforming public opinion and Louis XVIII to their ways of thinking. They brought together conflicting personalities and opinions, and for much of the two years of publication the optimism that they would succeed in their efforts somehow managed to continue, even if it meant periodically offering the Ministry an olive branch. [26] And beyond politics, the journal offered colorful pieces on religion,

25. "Politique," v.3, no.27, pp.3-13, April, 1819.

26. For example, "De la Liberté de la Presse," v.5, no.54, Oct., 1819, p.71.

literature, the arts, and history, which might have sustained an interest beyond the pessimism which was gradually encroaching on the political scene.

One cannot read Chateaubriand's articles, however, without feeling the frustration which emerged increasingly in his attacks on the Ministry and the direction France was taking. His admonitions took on the aura of inevitable failure, even while France had the greatest opportunity to achieve the harmony, domestic and foreign, which he had sought since 1814:

France, more than any other nation, is closer to strength, peace, and order than any nation in Europe. But within France, the Ministerial system threatens this good state; the Ministry is trying to do away with "les honnêtes gens," and if it does, it will destroy the peace of Europe.[27]

In one of his last articles, Chateaubriand predicted the downfall of the Decazes Ministry.[28] Little could he have known that Louvel's dagger would fulfill that prophecy, but the shock of the act only reinforced the blame for France's political turmoil which had been placed on the Ministry all along. Of course, no such blame was really appropriate; the crime only confirmed what the Royalists had been saying for some time, that the policies of the

27. "Politique," v.4, no.47, August, 1819, p.375.

28. "Lettre sur Paris," v.6, no.68, Jan., 1820, p. 144.

government were bringing France to ruin. Many had been saying so for years, and their antagonistic attitudes toward their opponents only widened the gulf between them.

Epilogue

Chateaubriand had tried to bring the factions together. Sincere if not naive, he had labored to reconcile almost impossible forces, and he himself, like the rest of France, had become a victim of them. After the murder of Berry, he gave up his political pen to seek his own ambitions, and ended up again, three years later, the great enemy of Ministerial government. Neither he alone, nor the Royalists, whose shouts of "Long live the King in spite of himself" betrayed their true feelings, brought down the reign of Charles X in 1830.

If anything was inevitable in the Restoration, it was only that the loss of Monarchic rule, by no means guaranteed either in 1815, nor in 1820, would at least guarantee for France decades of political confusion and turmoil. By sealing the fate of the Bourbons, France itself would have to answer to its actions. As de Bertier has written:

Who was the real loser - the nation, which at that hour [1830] thought it was victorious; or the obstinate old man who was leaving these shores for good? The latter was giving up the most glorious throne of the finest kingdom in Europe; the former was depriving itself of a principle of political authority, of national unity, and of social stability, the equivalent of which it was never again able to recapture. After a hundred and thirty years of revolutions and wars, of

dictatorial or anarchical governments, France can today estimate the irreparable seriousness of the wound which she inflicted upon herself by her eviction of Charles X, and she beholds with nostalgic envy her great neighbor across the Channel who had the wisdom to reconcile monarchical tradition with the inevitable democratic evolution.[1]

Sadly, what Chateaubriand had urged, that France must learn to accept the new principles of political authority while appreciating the advantages of monarchy, was lost upon the men of the Restoration. He had foreseen the consequences of extremism and blind ambitions where many had refused to see them. If there is any consolation, all could now, ironically, see the wisdom of de Bertier's conclusion.

1. De Bertier, The Restoration, p. 456.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Primary Materials, Chateaubriand

Essai Historique, Politique et Moral sur Les Revolutions anciennes et modernes, "Dedie a tous les parts. Oeuvres completes, v. 13. Paris: Administration de Librairie, 1852.

De Buonaparte et des Bourbons, et de la nécessité de se rallier a nos princes légitimes, pour le bonheur de la France et celui de l'Europe. Paris: Mame Freres, 1814.

La Monarchie selon la Charte. Oeuvres completes, v. 26. Bruxelles: P.-J. de Mat, 1835.

Le Conservateur. 6 vols. Paris: 1818-1820. Issued irregularly.

The Memoirs of Francois René Vicomte de Chateaubriand. Trans., Alexander Teixeira de Mattos. 6 vols. London: Freemantle and Co., 1902.

Correspondance générale. 5 vols. Ed., Pierre Riberette. Paris: Gallimard, 1979.

II. Secondary Works Cited

Beach, Vincent W., Charles X of France: His Life and Times. Boulder: Pruett Publishing Co., 1971.

Beck, Thomas D., French Legislators, 1800-1834. A Study in Quantitative History. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974.

Beik, Paul H., The French Revolution Seen From the Right. Social Theories in Motion, 1789-1799. (Transactions of the American Philosophical Society; New Series - Vol. 46, pt. 1). New York: Howard Fertig, 1970.

Bertier de Sauvigny, Guillaume de, The Bourbon Restoration. Trans., Lynn M. Case. Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Press, 1966.

Burke, Edmund, (and Thomas Paine), Reflections on the Revolution in France; and, The Rights of Man. New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1961.

Collins, Irene, The Government and the Newspaper Press in France, 1814-1881. London: Oxford University Press, 1959.

Geyl, Pieter, Napoleon, For and Against. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963.

Gooch, Brison D., Europe in th Nineteenth Century: A History. London: Rainbow Bridge, 1970.

Laski, Harold J., Studies in the Problem of Sovereignty. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1917.

Loménie, Emanuel Beau de, La carrière politique de Chateaubriand, de 1814 à 1830. 2 vols. Paris: Plon, 1929.

Mansel, Philip. Louis XVIII. London: Blond and Briggs, 1981.

Muret, Charlotte T., French Royalist Doctrines since the Revolution. New York: Columbia University Press, 1933.

Remond, Rene, The Right Wing in France, from 1815 to de Gaulle. Trans., James M. Laux. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1969.

Soltau, Roger Henry. French Political Thought in the Nineteenth Century. New York: Russell and Russell, 1959.

III. Secondary Works Consulted

André-Vincent, Philippe, Les idées politiques de Chateaubriand. Montpellier: 1936.

Bagge, Dominique, Les Idées Politiques en France sous la Restauration. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1952.

Baldensperger, Fernand, Le Mouvement des Idées dans l'Emigration Francaise, 1789-1815. 2 vols. New York: Burt Franklin, 1968 (Reprint from the edition of 1924).

Cassagne, Albert, La vie politique de Francois de Chateaubriand: Consulat, Empire, Première Restauration. Paris: Plon, 1911.

Harpaz, Ephraim. L'École Libérale sous la Restauration. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1968.

Hudson, Nora E., Ultra-Royalism and the French Restoration. New York: Farrar, Strauss & Giroux, 1972 (Reprint from the edition of 1936).

Kelly, G.A., "Liberalism and Aristocracy in the French Restoration," Journal of the History of Ideas. 26(1965): 509-30.

Ledré, Charles, La Presse a l'assaut de la Monarchie, 1815-1848. Paris: Armand Colin, 1960.

Mellon, Stanley, The Political Uses of History: A Study of Historians in the French Restoration. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1958.

Moreau, Pierre, Chateaubriand. Paris: Hatier, 1956.

Switzer, Richard, Chateaubriand. New York: Twayne, 1971.

Wright, Gordon, France in Modern Times. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1981. (Third Edition).

APPROVAL SHEET

The thesis submitted by Daniel T. Keefe has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Franklin A. Walker, Director
Professor, History, Loyola

Dr. Walter D. Gray
Chairman, History, Loyola

The final copies have been examined by the director of the thesis and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the thesis is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The thesis is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

12 December 1984

Date

Franklin A. Walker

Director's Signature